

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 10-16, 19 and 21-30 have been examined and are all the claims pending in the present application.

I. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-7, 10-16, 19 and 21-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Dutta et al. (hereafter Dutta) (U.S. 6,918,066 in view of Sanders (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/008871). Applicants traverse the rejection based on the following comments.

A. Claims 1-3 and 10-12

Claim 1 recites:

A browser testing system comprises a browser test server connected via one or more wired or wireless communication networks to a device equipped with a browser operable to access the Internet,
wherein one or more test cases to test the browser are registered with the browser test server,

wherein the browser test server provides a tester with a session generated from one or more predetermined test cases according to a selection of the one of more test cases registered with the browser test server by the tester accessing the browser test server through the communication networks, and

wherein the browser test server stores one or more values obtained from browser testing by use of the session,

wherein each of the test cases is a contents file including one or more tags or one or more script symbols corresponding to predetermined contents that will be tested as to whether the contents are normally provided through the browser, and

the session includes the one or more predetermined test cases selected by the tester which constitute a single web page and the session is the web page for the browser testing, the web page having a predetermined URL address that indicates a location where the web page is registered on the browser test server. (emphasis added)

Dutta teaches that a single web page (i.e., one version of a web page) is tested against a multitude of web browsers (e.g., Internet Explorer, etc.) at the same time and displays the output

thereof (Abstract and col. 4, lines 19-65). Sanders teaches that multiple versions of a web page are each stored in one of a plurality of web servers 20a-d, and one version of a web page, which is capable of being processed by the web browser, is selected to be viewed based on which web browser is being used (paragraphs 14-16, 32 and 33). Thus, the Examiner appears to assert that Dutta, in view of Sanders, teaches storing multiple versions of a web page to be tested according to the method taught in Dutta. However, even if multiple versions of a web page can be stored in web servers, Sanders does not correct the deficiencies of Dutta.

For example, the Examiner asserts that a session is interpreted as a communication link to exchange data (see page 3, lines 10-12 of the Office Action). However, a session is clearly defined within the claims to be a web page which is generated from the test cases (i.e., from contents files). Furthermore, the Examiner asserts that the test case is the WML/HTML web page itself (see page 3, line 12 of the Office Action). This is clearly erroneous since the test cases are not the web pages, but instead the contents files used to generate the web pages. Further, the test cases are not defined within the claim to have a URL address, but instead, the session (i.e., the web page) is.

Since Dutta and/or Sanders fail to teach or suggest registering test cases, not versions of web pages, in the browser test server, Dutta and Sanders also fail to teach generating a session (i.e., web page) from one or more predetermined test cases according to a selection of the one of more test cases registered with the browser test server by the tester. That is, Dutta and Sanders do not teach or suggest that test cases (i.e., contents files) are registered with a browser test server, to be selected by the tester to generate a session (i.e., a web page) for testing the test cases, as required by claim 1. Sanders does not give a tester an option to select various test cases

to generate a session, but instead, merely permits the storing of various web pages. Thus, there is limited flexibility for actually testing registered test cases to determine whether the contents are normally provided through the browser.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that Dutta, alone or in combination with Sanders, fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 1.

Claims 2, 3 and 10-12 include analogous, though not necessarily coextensive features recited in claim 1, and therefore, claims 2, 3 and 10-12 should be patentable for the reasons discussed for claim 1.

B. Claims 4, 14, 15 and 16

Claim 4 recites, *inter alia*, “a first platform for developing a test case, into which the test case for testing the browser is entered and registered with a database.” The Examiner asserts that a scorecard taught in Dutta teaches the claimed first platform. However, the scorecard is not a platform which develops test cases for registering with a database. A scorecard cannot create a test case. Furthermore, Dutta fails to teach developing test cases according to the requirements of claim 1. Therefore, claim 4 should be patentable for at least this reason.

Claim 14 recites, *inter alia*, “creating one or more contents files for use in testing the browser as to whether the test cases are normally provided through the selected browser and its version, and registering the created contents files in the database by category.” Again, Dutta fails to disclose that content files are used in testing for determining (testing) whether the test cases are normally provided through the selected browser and its version. Applicants submit that a test case is not a web page for reasons presented above in conjunction with claim 1. Therefore,

claim 14 should be patentable for at least this reason. Claim 16 should also be patentable for similar reasons.

Claim 15 recites, *inter alia*, “selecting the one or more test cases to be tested among the test cases registered in the selected browser and its version and creating a session with the selected test cases.” However, Dutta does not disclose testing the test cases as claimed. Therefore, claim 15 should be patentable for at least this reason.

C. Claims 6, 7 and 13

Claim 6 recites, *inter alia*, “reporting the result of the browser testing includes representing the values for the test cases as at least one of tables and graphs and outputting the represented values as a document.” (emphasis added). Dutta, at best discloses representing values for the web page as a whole such that the user can judge whether to modify the source code. Dutta, however, does not disclose that the values are for the test cases (i.e., the contents files) in view of claim 1. Applicants submit that a test case is not a web page for reasons presented above in conjunction with claim 1. Therefore, claim 6 should be patentable for at least this reason.

In addition, claim 7 recites, *inter alia*, “reporting the result of the browser testing includes creating a new session by extracting, deleting or adding only those test cases having a particular value from or to the predetermined test cases and retesting the browser by using the newly created session.” (emphasis added). For similar reasons presented above in conjunction with claim 6, Dutta does not disclose providing test cases with a particular value as a result of the testing. Therefore, claim 7 should be patentable for at least this reason.

In addition, claim 13 recites, inter alia, “a test result reporting step of editing the test cases, which constitute the session and have the result values, and reporting the result values of the browser testing.” (emphasis added). For similar reasons presented above in conjunction with claims 6 and 7, Dutta does not disclose test cases having the result values. Therefore, claim 13 should be patentable for at least this reason.

D. Claim 19

Claim 19 recites “a plurality of test cases to test the browser are registered with the browser test server.” The Examiner asserts that Sanders teaches storing multiple versions of web pages on a web server. However, Applicants submit that the claimed test cases are not web pages for reasons presented above in conjunction with claim 1. Therefore, Dutta, alone or in combination with Sanders, fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 19.

E. Claims 21, 23-27 and 30

Applicants submit that claim 21 and 23-27 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies. In addition, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the claims in view of the comments presented above in conjunction with claim 1. In particular, the Examiner appears to misconstrue the claims (i.e., that a test case is a web page) throughout the entire Office Action. Therefore, Dutta and Sanders fail to teach or suggest that the claimed values correspond to the test cases.

F. Remaining claims

Applicants submit that the remaining claims are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,


Ryan F. Heavener
Registration No. 61,512

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 31, 2008